

# Remarks on random dynamical systems with inputs and outputs and a small-gain theorem for monotone RDS

Michael Marcondes de Freitas and Eduardo D. Sontag  
Mathematics Department  
Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, USA

July 9, 2012

## Abstract

This note introduces a new notion of random dynamical system with inputs and outputs, and sketches a small-gain theorem for monotone systems which generalizes a similar theorem known for deterministic systems.

## 1 Introduction

*Monotone systems*, whose mathematical development was pioneered by Hirsch [9, 10] and Smith [12, 11], play a key role in many application areas, and particularly in the modeling and analysis of biological systems. They constitute a class of dynamical systems for which a rich theory exists, endowing them with very robust dynamical characteristics. In order to analyze interconnections of monotone systems, however, it is necessary to extend the notion and introduce the concept of *monotone systems with inputs and outputs*, as standard in control theory [13], so as to incorporate input and output channels. This was done in [1], which also presented a result that guarantees stability of monotone systems under negative feedback (so that the closed-loop system is no longer monotone); this result may be viewed as a “small gain theorem” in terms of an appropriate notion of system gain.

An interesting question is: to what extent do results for monotone I/O systems extend to the analysis of systems subject to stochastic uncertainty or random inputs? This paper proposes an approach based upon the notion of “random dynamical system” (RDS) due to Arnold [2], and more specifically the subclass of *monotone* RDS studied in [4]. Even more than when passing from deterministic monotone systems to monotone systems with inputs and outputs, the generalization is not entirely straightforward, and many subtle mathematical and conceptual details have to be worked out. We introduce the necessary formalism in this note (in a more general context of not necessarily monotone systems) and sketch an analogue of the small gain theorem proved in [1].

## 2 Random Dynamical Systems

We start by reviewing, with some added concepts and slight changes of notations, the formalism of RDS’s introduced by L. Arnold.

## 2.1 Basic Definitions

We suppose given a Borel subset  $X$  of a separable Banach space  $V$ , constituting the measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  when equipped with the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  of Borel subsets of  $X$ . We also suppose given a *measure preserving dynamical system*<sup>1</sup>  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}})$ ; that is, a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  together with a flow  $\theta : \mathcal{T} \times \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  satisfying

- (T1)  $\theta_t := \theta(t, \cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ ,
- (T2)  $\theta_{t+s} = \theta_t \circ \theta_s$  for every  $t, s \in \mathcal{T}$  (semigroup property),
- (T3)  $\mathbb{P} \circ \theta_t = \mathbb{P}$  for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  (measure preserving<sup>2</sup>).

As usual,  $\mathcal{T}$  refers to either  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{Z}$  depending on whether one is talking about continuous or discrete time, respectively. In either case  $\mathcal{T}_+$  refers to the nonnegative elements of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We note the abuse of notation in using the same symbol  $\theta$  to denote both the measure preserving dynamical system, as well as its constituting measure preserving flow. This will be very unlikely to cause any confusion. When  $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{Z}$ , that is, in discrete time, it follows from (T2) that  $\theta$  is completely determined by  $\theta_1 = \theta(1, \cdot)$  and so we shall use  $\theta$  to denote  $\theta_1$  as well.

A (continuous) random dynamical system (RDS)  $\varphi$  with state space  $X$ , over  $\theta$  is a measurable map  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \times X \rightarrow X$  such that

- (S1)  $\varphi(t, \omega) := \varphi(t, \omega, \cdot) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}_+$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,
- (S2)  $\varphi(0, \omega) = id_X$  for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and

$$\varphi(t + s, \omega) = \varphi(t, \theta_s \omega) \circ \varphi(s, \omega)$$

for each  $s, t \in \mathcal{T}_+$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  (cocycle property).

Notice that RDSs include deterministic dynamical systems as the special case in which  $\Omega$  is a singleton. The cocycle property generalizes the semigroup property of deterministic dynamical systems.

Here the analogue to points in the state space  $X$  for a deterministic system are random variables  $\Omega \rightarrow X$ , that is,  $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable maps  $\Omega \rightarrow X$ . We denote the set of all such maps by  $X_B^\Omega$ . We say that a map  $q : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow X$  is a  $\theta$ -stochastic process on  $X$ , or simply a *random trajectory*, if  $q(t, \cdot) \in X_B^\Omega$  for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ .

Given  $\xi_0 \in X_B^\Omega$ , we define the *trajectory starting at  $\xi_0$*  to be the map  $\xi : \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow X$  which is defined by

$$\xi(t, \omega) := \varphi(t, \omega, \xi_0(\omega)), \quad (t, \omega) \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega. \quad (1)$$

Recall from [4, Definition 1.7.1 on page 38] that an *equilibrium* of an RDS is by definition a random variable  $\bar{\xi} : \Omega \rightarrow X$  such that

$$\varphi(t, \omega, \bar{\xi}(\omega)) = \bar{\xi}(\theta_t \omega)$$

for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

The remaining of this section is devoted to interpreting the concept of equilibrium for an RDS in terms of a shift operator in the set  $S_\theta^X$  of all  $\theta$ -stochastic processes on  $X$ . For each  $s \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$  let

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_s : S_\theta^X &\longrightarrow S_\theta^X \\ q &\longmapsto \rho_s(q) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

<sup>1</sup>Some authors [4, Definition 1.1.1 on page 10], [2, page 635] refer to such an object primarily as a *metric dynamical system*. We find *measure preserving*, which [2] also uses as a synonym, less confusing and more informative.

<sup>2</sup> Property (T3) is normally stated as

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta_t^{-1}(B)) = \mathbb{P}(B), \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{F}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

But since it follows from (T2) that  $\theta_t$  is invertible with  $\theta_t^{-1} = \theta_{-t}$  for each  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , the two formulations are equivalent.

be defined by

$$(\rho_s(q))(t, \omega) := q(t + s, \theta_{-s}\omega), \quad (t, \omega) \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega. \quad (3)$$

**Definition 2.1** A  $\theta$ -stochastic process  $q$  is said to be  $\theta$ -constant if

$$\rho_s(q) = q$$

for all  $s \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ . □

**Lemma 2.2** The  $\theta$ -stochastic process  $q$  is  $\theta$ -constant if and only if there exists a random variable  $\bar{q} : \Omega \rightarrow X$  such that

$$q(t, \omega) = \bar{q}(\theta_t \omega), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \quad (4)$$

*Proof.* (Sufficiency.) Suppose that  $q(t, \omega) = \bar{q}(\theta_t \omega)$  for all  $t, \omega$ , for some  $\bar{q} \in X_B^\Omega$ . Pick any  $s \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ . For any  $t, \omega$ ,

$$(\rho_s(q))(t, \omega) = q(t + s, \theta_{-s}\omega) = \bar{q}(\theta_{t+s}\theta_{-s}\omega) = \bar{q}(\theta_t \omega) = q(t, \omega),$$

and thus  $\rho_s(q) = q$ .

(Necessity.) Suppose that  $\rho_s(q) = q$  for all  $s$ , and define  $\bar{q} : \Omega \rightarrow X$  by

$$\bar{q}(\omega) := q(0, \omega)$$

for each  $\omega$ . The equality  $\rho_s(q) = q$  means that  $(\rho_s(q))(t, \omega) = q(t, \omega)$  for all  $s, t, \omega$ . Using the definition of  $\rho$ , that is,  $(\rho_s(q))(t, \omega) = q(t + s, \theta_{-s}\omega)$ , this translates into:

$$q(t + s, \theta_{-s}\omega) = q(t, \omega)$$

for all  $s, t, \omega$ . In particular, applied with  $t = 0$ , and renaming “ $s$ ” as “ $t$ ,” we have that

$$q(t, \theta_{-t}\hat{\omega}) = q(0, \hat{\omega}) = \bar{q}(\hat{\omega})$$

for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$  and all  $\hat{\omega} \in \Omega$ . Given any  $\omega \in \Omega$  and any  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ , we may apply this property with  $\hat{\omega} = \theta_t \omega$ , obtaining

$$q(t, \omega) = \bar{q}(\theta_t \omega),$$

which is what we wanted to prove. ■

Note that the random variable  $\bar{q}$  associated to  $q$  is unique, since it has to satisfy Equation (4), and therefore is determined by  $\bar{q}(\omega) = q(0, \omega)$ . Thus, we have:

**Corollary 2.3** For any RDS and any random state  $\xi_0 \in X_B^\Omega$ , the following two properties are equivalent:

1.  $\xi$ , as defined in (1), is a  $\theta$ -constant trajectory;
2.  $\bar{\xi} := \xi_0$  is an equilibrium.

We will always use an overbar to denote the random variable  $\bar{q}$  associated to a given  $\theta$ -constant process  $q$ .

## 2.2 Convergence

We work with the notion of “pull-back convergence” developed in the literature and canonized in the works of Arnold and Chueshov [2, 4].

**Definition 2.4** (Pull-Back Convergence) A  $\theta$ -stochastic process  $\xi : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow X$  is said to *converge* to a random variable  $\xi_0 \in X_B^\Omega$  in the *pull-back sense* if

$$\xi(t, \theta_{-t}\omega) \longrightarrow \xi_0(\omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for almost all } \omega \in \Omega.$$

The reasons for pursuing convergence in the pull-back sense are historical. It has been shown to be more fruitful than the perhaps more intuitive convergence of the forward trajectories  $t \mapsto \xi(t, \omega)$ . The two modes of convergence are not equivalent, as illustrated by Examples 2.5 and 2.6 below.

**Example 2.5** Convergence in the pull-back sense does not imply convergence in the forward sense. Consider the measure preserving dynamical system  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}})$  where  $\Omega := \{-1, 1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra of all subsets of  $\Omega$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$  is the uniform probability defined by  $\mathbb{P}(\{-1\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{1\}) = 1/2$ , and  $\theta$  is the measure preserving dynamical system generated by

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : \Omega &\longrightarrow \Omega \\ \omega &\longmapsto -\omega \end{aligned}.$$

Then

$$\theta_n(\omega) = (-1)^n \omega, \quad \omega = -1, 1, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let  $X := \{-1, 1\}$  also, and consider the random variable

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_0 : \Omega &\longrightarrow \Omega \\ \omega &\longmapsto \omega \end{aligned}$$

and the trajectory

$$\begin{aligned} \xi : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega &\longrightarrow \Omega \\ (n, \omega) &\longmapsto (-1)^n \omega \end{aligned}.$$

Then  $\xi$  converges to  $\xi_0$  in the pull-back sense:

$$\xi(n, \theta_{-n}\omega) = (-1)^n \theta_{-n}(\omega) = (-1)^0 \omega = \omega, \quad \omega = -1, 1.$$

However  $\xi$  clearly does not converge in the forward sense.

This example is assumedly trivial and artificial but illustrates the point. A similar construction yields a counterexample to the hypothesis that convergence in the forward sense implies convergence in the pull-back sense.

**Example 2.6** Convergence in the forward sense does not imply convergence in the pull-back sense. Consider the same measure preserving dynamical system  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}})$ , state space  $X$  and random variable  $\xi_0$  as in the previous example. The trajectory

$$\begin{aligned} \xi : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega &\longrightarrow \Omega \\ (n, \omega) &\longmapsto \omega \end{aligned}$$

converges to  $\xi_0$  in the forward sense, but not in the pull-back sense:

$$\xi(n, \theta_{-n}\omega) = \theta_{-n}(\omega) = (-1)^{-n} \omega, \quad \omega = -1, 1.$$

**Proposition 2.7** Let  $\varphi : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \rightarrow X$  be an RDS over an MPDS  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\theta_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}})$ , evolving on a metric space  $X$ . Suppose there exists a random initial state  $x_0 \in X_{\mathcal{B}(X)}^\Omega$  such that almost all the pull-back trajectories of  $\varphi$  starting at  $x_0$  converge to some map  $\bar{x} : \Omega \rightarrow X$ ; that is,

$$\varphi(t, \theta_{-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{-t}\omega)) \longrightarrow \bar{x}(\omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega. \quad (5)$$

Then  $\bar{x}$  is an equilibrium.

*Proof.* For each  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ , the map  $\omega \mapsto \varphi(t, \theta_{-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{-t}\omega))$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ , is measurable, since it's the composition of measurable maps:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega &\mapsto \theta_{-t}\omega \mapsto x_0(\theta_{-t}\omega), \\ (\theta_{-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{-t}\omega)) &\mapsto \varphi(t, \theta_{-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{-t}\omega)). \end{aligned}$$

So it follows from Lemma A.1 that  $\bar{x}$  is measurable. (If  $\mathcal{T}$  is continuous time, just pick a subsequence  $(t_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  going to infinity.)

In addition, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that the limit in (5) exists, and each  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ , we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(t - \tau, \theta_{\tau-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{\tau-t}\omega)) = \bar{x}(\omega)$$

also. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{x}(\theta_\tau\omega) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(t, \theta_{-t}\theta_\tau\omega, x_0(\theta_{-t}\theta_\tau\omega)) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(t - \tau + \tau, \theta_{\tau-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{\tau-t}\omega)) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(\tau, \theta_{t-\tau+\tau-t}\omega, \varphi(t - \tau, \theta_{\tau-t}\omega, x_0(\theta_{\tau-t}\omega))) \\ &= \varphi(\tau, \omega, \bar{x}(\omega)) \end{aligned}$$

by continuity. ■

## 2.3 Discrete Time RDS's

When  $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{Z}$  we refer to  $\varphi$  as a *discrete random dynamical system*, or a *discrete RDS* for short. These constitute a significantly simpler special case. For instance, the whole dynamics  $\varphi$  can be inductively recovered from its transition mapping

$$\begin{aligned} f : \Omega \times X &\longrightarrow X \\ (\omega, x) &\longmapsto \varphi(1, \omega, x) \end{aligned}$$

(plus of course the underlying measure preserving dynamical system  $\theta$ ). What we mean by this is that  $f$  is measurable,  $f(\omega, \cdot) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and

$$\varphi(0, \omega, x) = x, \quad (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times X, \quad (6)$$

$$\varphi(1, \omega, x) = f(\omega, x), \quad (\omega, x) \in \Omega \times X, \quad (7)$$

$$\varphi(n+1, \omega, x) = f(\theta_n\omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x)), \quad (n, \omega, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \Omega \times X. \quad (8)$$

Conversely, if  $f : \Omega \times X \rightarrow X$  is measurable and  $f(\omega, \cdot) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then equations (6)–(8) define a discrete RDS. We shall get back to this in more detail in Subsection 3.3. There we will discuss generators of random discrete dynamical systems with inputs, which include generators of discrete RDSs as a special case.

## 2.4 Continuous Time RDS's

An entirely analogous method allows one to define RDS's generated by random differential equations.

### 3 Random Dynamical Systems with Inputs and Outputs

We now define a new concept that extends the notion of RDS to systems in which there is an external input or forcing function which is itself a stochastic process. A contribution of this work is the precise formulation of this concept, particularly the way in which the stochastic argument of the input is shifted in the semigroup (cocycle) property. *Note that stochasticity of inputs is essential if one is to develop a theory of interconnected subsystems, as an input to one system in such an interconnection is typically obtained by using a combination of outputs (necessarily random) of other subsystems.*

As in the previous section, given a metric space  $U$  we equip it with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}(U)$  and denote by  $U_{\mathcal{B}}^{\Omega}$  the set of Borel measurable maps  $\Omega \rightarrow U$ , and by  $\mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$  the set of all random trajectories  $\mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow U$ .

**Definition 3.1** A *random dynamical system with inputs (RDSI)* is a pair  $(\theta, \varphi)$  consisting of a measure preserving dynamical system  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}})$  and a map

$$\varphi : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U \rightarrow X$$

satisfying

- (I1)  $\varphi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, u) : \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \times X \rightarrow X$  is measurable for each  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ ;
- (I2)  $\varphi(t, \omega, \cdot, u) : X \rightarrow X$  is continuous, for each  $(t, \omega, u) \in \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \times \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ ;
- (I3)  $\varphi(0, \omega, x, u) = x$  for each  $(\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ ;
- (I4) given  $s, t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ , suppose

$$\varphi(s, \omega, x, u) = y$$

and

$$\varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, y, v) = z.$$

Then

$$\varphi(t + s, \omega, x, w) = z,$$

where  $w : \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \rightarrow U$  is defined by

$$w_{\tau}(\omega) = \begin{cases} u(\tau, \omega), & 0 \leq \tau < s \\ v(\tau - s, \theta_s \omega), & s \leq \tau \end{cases}, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}_+, \omega \in \Omega.$$

- (I5) given  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$ , and  $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ , if  $u_{\tau}(\omega) = v_{\tau}(\omega)$  for almost all  $\tau \in [0, t]$ , then  $\varphi(t, \omega, x, u) = \varphi(t, \omega, x, v)$ .

We refer to the elements  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ , that is, the  $\theta$ -stochastic processes (or random trajectories) on  $U$  as *inputs*. Whenever we talk about a RDSI we tacitly assume the notation laid down above, unless otherwise specified.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2** 0. (I1)–(I2) are regularity conditions. (I3) means that nothing has happened if one is still at time  $t = 0$ . (I4) generalizes the cocycle property and (I5) states that the evolution of an RDS is, so to speak, independent of irrelevant random states.

1. Notice that for each  $s, t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$\varphi(t + s, \omega, x, u) = \varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, \varphi(s, \omega, x, u), \rho_s(u))$$

for all  $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$ . This follows by (I4) with  $v = \rho_s(u)$ , which then renders  $w = u$ .

2. If  $u, \hat{u} \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta}^U$  are such that  $u(\cdot, \omega)|_{[0, t]} = \hat{u}(\cdot, \omega)|_{[0, t]}$  almost surely for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then

$$\varphi(\tau, \omega, x, u) = \varphi(\tau, \omega, x, \hat{u})$$

for each  $t \in [0, t]$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$ . This follows straight from (I5).

Recalling the definitions stated in Equations (2)–(3),

$$(\rho_s(u))(t, \theta_s \omega) = u(t + s, \omega);$$

the right-hand side is the input as interpreted by an observer of the RDSI  $\varphi$  who started at time  $t_1 = 0$ , while the left-hand side is how someone who started observing the system at time  $t_2 = s$  would describe it at time  $t$  ( $+ t_2$ ). Following this interpretation, a  $\theta$ -constant input would then be an input which is observed to be just the same, regardless of when one started observing it.

**Definition 3.3** A random dynamical system with inputs and outputs (RDSIO) is a triple  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$ , such that  $(\theta, \varphi)$  is an RDSI, and

$$h : \Omega \times X \rightarrow V$$

is such that  $h(\cdot, x) \in V_{\mathcal{B}(V)}^\Omega$  for each  $x \in X$ . □

The concepts of RDSI and RDSIO subsume that of RDS, since one may view an RDSI as a special case in which  $U$  consists of just one point. The notion of trajectory extends naturally:

**Definition 3.4** Given any RDSI, any random state  $\xi_0 \in X_{\mathcal{B}}^\Omega$ , and any input  $u \in S_\theta^U$ , the  $\theta$ -stochastic process  $\xi_u : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow X$  defined by

$$\xi_u(t, \omega) := \varphi(t, \omega, \xi_0(\omega), u), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_+, \omega \in \Omega,$$

will be called the *trajectory corresponding to the initial random state  $\xi_0$  and input  $u$* . For an RDSIO, the  $\theta$ -stochastic process  $\eta_u : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow V$  defined by

$$\eta_u(t, \omega) := h(\theta_t \omega, \varphi(t, \omega, \xi_0(\omega), u)), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_+, \omega \in \Omega,$$

will be called the *output (trajectory) corresponding to the initial random state  $\xi_0$  and input  $u$* . □

Note that one can also write

$$\eta_u(t, \omega) := h(\theta_t \omega, \xi_u(t, \omega)).$$

### 3.1 RDSI's for constant inputs are RDS's

Denote the subset of  $S_\theta^U$  consisting of  $\theta$ -constant inputs by  $\hat{S}_\theta^U$ . Let  $(\theta, \varphi)$  be a RDSI, and suppose that  $u \in \hat{S}_\theta^U$  is some  $\theta$ -constant input. We consider the map

$$\varphi_u : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \rightarrow X : (t, \omega, x) \mapsto \varphi(t, \omega, x, u).$$

**Lemma 3.5** The pair  $(\theta, \varphi_u)$  is an RDS.

*Proof.* It follows from condition (I1) that  $\varphi_u$  is measurable and from (I3) that  $\varphi_u(0, \omega, \cdot) = id_X$  for every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , so it remains to prove that  $\varphi_u$  satisfies the cocycle property. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_u(t + s, \omega, x) &= \varphi(t + s, \omega, x, u) \\ &= \varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, \varphi(s, \omega, x, u), \rho_s(u)) \\ &= \varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, \varphi_u(s, \omega, x), u) \\ &= \varphi_u(t, \theta_s \omega, \varphi_u(s, \omega, x)), \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $u$  is  $\theta$ -constant, that is, that  $\rho_s(u) = u$ . ■

### 3.2 Characteristics

**Definition 3.6** Let  $(\theta, \varphi)$  be a RDSI, and suppose that  $\mu \in \hat{S}_\theta^U$  (with corresponding random variable  $\bar{\mu}$ ). An *equilibrium associated to  $\bar{\mu}$*  (or to  $\mu$ ) is any equilibrium  $\bar{\xi}$  of the RDS  $(\theta, \varphi_\mu)$ . The set of all equilibria associated to  $\bar{\mu}$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$ .  $\square$

That is, an element  $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$  is a random variable  $\Omega \rightarrow X$  such that

$$\varphi(t, \omega, \bar{\xi}(\omega), \mu) = \bar{\xi}(\theta_t \omega) \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}, \forall \omega \in \Omega. \quad (9)$$

When we have an RDS (no inputs), we write simply  $\mathcal{E}$  for the set of equilibria.

For deterministic systems ( $\Omega$  has one point), when the set  $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$  consists of a single element, the mapping  $\bar{\mu} \mapsto \mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$  is the object called the “input to state characteristic” in the literature on monotone i/o systems. For systems with outputs, composition with the output map  $h$  provides the “input to output” characteristic. We extend this notion to RDSIs.

**Definition 3.7** An RDSI  $(\theta, \varphi)$  is said to have an *input to state characteristic*  $k : \hat{S}_\theta^U \rightarrow X_B^\Omega$  if

$$\varphi_u(t, \theta_{-t}\omega, x(\omega)) \longrightarrow k_u(\omega) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{for almost all } \omega \in \Omega,$$

for each  $\theta$ -constant input  $u \in \hat{S}_\theta^U$  and any random initial state  $x \in X_B^\Omega$ .

**Lemma 3.8** Suppose that  $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$  and define

$$\eta : \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow Y$$

by

$$\eta(t, \omega) := h(\varphi(t, \omega, \bar{\xi}(\omega), \mu), \theta_t \omega).$$

Then,  $\eta$  is  $\theta$ -constant.

*Proof.* Using (9), we have that, for all  $t, s, \omega$ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\rho_s(\eta))(t, \omega) &= \eta(t + s, \theta_{-s}\omega) \\ &= h(\varphi(t + s, \theta_{-s}\omega, \bar{\xi}(\theta_{-s}\omega), \mu), \theta_{t+s}\theta_{-s}\omega) \\ &= h(\bar{\xi}(\theta_{t+s}\theta_{-s}\omega), \theta_t\omega) \\ &= h(\bar{\xi}(\theta_t\omega), \theta_t\omega) \\ &= h(\varphi(t, \omega, \bar{\xi}(\omega), \mu), \theta_t\omega) \\ &= \eta(t, \omega), \end{aligned}$$

proving that  $\rho_s(\eta) = \eta$  for all  $s \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$ , that is,  $\eta$  is  $\theta$ -constant.  $\blacksquare$

**Definition 3.9** Let  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$  be a RDSIO, and suppose that  $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$ . Then  $\bar{\eta}$  (or  $\eta$ ) as defined in Lemma 3.8 is an *output equilibrium associated to  $\bar{\mu}$*  (or  $\mu$ ). The set of all output equilibria associated to  $\bar{\mu}$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mu})$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.10** [Uniformly Tempered] A sequence  $(b_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of random variables  $\Omega \rightarrow X$  is said to be uniformly tempered in the metric space  $X$  if, for every  $\gamma > 0$  and every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there exists a  $K \geq 0$  such that

$$\sup_{s \in \mathcal{T}} |b_k(\theta_s \omega)| e^{-\gamma|s|} \leq K, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**Definition 3.11** [Continuity of the I/S Characteristic] Suppose an RDSI  $\varphi: \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \times S_\theta^U \rightarrow X$  has an input to state characteristic  $K^X: \Omega \times U_B^\Omega \rightarrow X$ . The map  $K^X$  is said to be *continuous* if, for every uniformly tempered sequence  $(b_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $U_B^\Omega$ , the sequence  $(K^X(\cdot, b_k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly tempered in  $X_B^\Omega$ .

We extend this definition to the composition with the output map as well ( $\mathcal{K}$ ). Continuity will follow from a Lipschitz property and tempered assumption on  $h$ . Tools from ergodic theory as in [4] can be used to establish existence of characteristics, as well as continuity, for several classes of systems.

A key result (see below) will be that, for monotone RDSI with continuous (in this sense) characteristics, the “CICS” (Converging Input/Converging State) property holds. This property is generally not true for (even deterministic) non-monotone systems.

### 3.3 Discrete Time RDSIs

Like before, when  $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{Z}$  we refer to  $\varphi$  as a *random discrete dynamical system with inputs (and outputs)*, or *discrete RDSI (RDSIO)* for short. We now discuss how these are generated recursively by transition mappings. For each  $u \in U$  we will denote by  $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$  the trivial  $\theta$ -stochastic process defined by

$$\bar{u}(t, \omega) := u, \quad (t, \omega) \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega.$$

Let  $f: \Omega \times X \times U \rightarrow X$  be defined by

$$f(\omega, x, u) := \varphi(1, \omega, x, \bar{u}), \quad (\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times U. \quad (10)$$

Then

$$\varphi(1, \omega, x, u) = f(\omega, x, u(0, \omega)), \quad (\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_\theta^U. \quad (11)$$

Indeed, it follows from (10) that

$$\varphi(1, \omega, x, \overline{u(0, \omega)}) = f(\omega, x, u(0, \omega)), \quad (\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times U.$$

On the other hand it follows from (I5) that

$$\varphi(1, \omega, x, u) = \varphi(1, \omega, x, \overline{u(0, \omega)}).$$

This shows (11). It then follows from (I4) that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(n+1, \omega, x, u) &= \varphi(1, \theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x, u), \rho_n(u)) \\ &= f(\theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x, u), (\rho_n(u))(0, \theta_n \omega)) \\ &= f(\theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x, u), u(n, \omega)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the dynamics  $\varphi$  is all encoded in  $f$ . Observe that

$$f(\cdot, \cdot, u): \Omega \times X \rightarrow X$$

is measurable for each  $u \in U$ , and that

$$f(\omega, \cdot, u): X \rightarrow X$$

is continuous for each  $(\omega, u) \in \Omega \times U$ .

Conversely, suppose  $f: \Omega \times X \times U \rightarrow X$  is such that  $f(\cdot, \cdot, u)$  is measurable for each  $u \in U$ , and  $f(\omega, \cdot, u)$  is continuous for each  $(\omega, u) \in \Omega \times U$ . Define  $\varphi: \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_\theta^U \rightarrow X$  recursively by

$$\varphi(0, \omega, x, u) := x, \quad (\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_\theta^U, \quad (12)$$

$$\varphi(1, \omega, x, u) := f(\omega, x, u(0, \omega)), \quad (\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_\theta^U, \quad (13)$$

and

$$\varphi(n+1, \omega, x, u) := f(\theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x, u), u(n, \omega)), \quad (\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times \mathcal{S}_\theta^U, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (14)$$

recursively. We claim that  $\varphi$  is a discrete RDSI, that is, that it satisfies (I1)–(I5).

(I1) Fixed  $u \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$  and  $A \in \mathcal{B}(X)$  arbitrarily we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, u))^{-1}(A) &= \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \{n\} \times (\varphi(n, \cdot, \cdot, u))^{-1}(A) \\ &= (\{0\} \times \Omega \times A) \cup \left( \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{n\} \times (f(\theta_{n-1}(\cdot), \varphi(n-1, \cdot, \cdot, u), u(n-1, \cdot)))^{-1}(A) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows by induction on  $n$  that  $f(\theta_{n-1}(\cdot), \varphi(n-1, \cdot, \cdot, u), u(n-1, \cdot))^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(X)$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus

$$(\varphi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, u))^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \times \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(X) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \otimes \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}(X).$$

(I2) For  $t = 0$  or  $t = 1$ , this follows straight from (12), (13) together with the hypothesis that  $f(\omega, \cdot, u)$  is continuous for each  $(\omega, u) \in \Omega \times U$ . For  $n \geq 2$ , it follows by induction on  $n$  by means of equation (14), since  $f(\theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, \cdot, u), u(n, \omega))$  will be continuous whenever  $\varphi(n, \omega, \cdot, u)$  is.

(I3) This is just equation (12).

(I4) For each fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$ ,  $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$ , and  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , we use induction on  $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . For  $t = 0$ , (I4) holds trivially in virtue of (I5) (see below). Now suppose it holds for  $t = 0, 1, \dots, t_0$ . Define  $y, z, w$  as in the statement of (I5). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t_0 + 1, \theta_s \omega, y, v) &= f(\theta_{t_0} \theta_s \omega, \varphi(t_0, \theta_s \omega, y, v), v(t_0, \theta_s)) \\ &= f(\theta_{t_0+s} \omega, \varphi(t_0 + s, \omega, x, w), w(t_0 + s, \omega)) \\ &= \varphi(t_0 + s + 1, \omega, x, w). \end{aligned}$$

(I5) This follows from induction on  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Fix  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$  and  $u \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$  arbitrarily. Equations (12) and (13) give us the base of the induction. Now if  $u(\tau, \omega) = v(\tau, \omega)$  for  $\tau = 0, 1, \dots, t$  and we have already verified (I5) when this happens for  $\tau = 0, 1, \dots, t-1$ , then  $\varphi(t, \omega, x, u) = \varphi(t, \omega, x, v)$  and so it follows from (14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t+1, \omega, x, u) &= f(\theta_t \omega, \varphi(t, \omega, x, u), u(t, \omega)) \\ &= f(\theta_t \omega, \varphi(t, \omega, x, v), v(t, \omega)) \\ &= \varphi(t+1, \omega, x, v). \end{aligned}$$

### 3.4 RDSI's Generated by Random Differential Equations with Inputs

We now consider one of the prototypes for continuous time random dynamical systems with inputs (RDSI) from which we shall draw most of our nontrivial explicit examples, namely, RDSI's generated by random differential equations (with inputs).

**Definition 3.12** [Right-Hand Side] Let  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, (\theta_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}})$  be a continuous time MPDS,  $X$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $U$  a metric space. A *right-hand side (rhs)* with respect to  $\theta$ ,  $X$  and  $U$  is a map  $f: \Omega \times X \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$

**Definition 3.13** [Solution of An RDEI] Let  $f: \Omega \times X \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be an rhs with respect to  $\theta$ ,  $X$  and  $U$ . Given an environmental condition  $\omega \in \Omega$ , an initial condition  $x_0 \in X$  and an input  $u: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow U$ , a *solution of the random initial value problem*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} &= f(\theta_t \omega, x, u(t)) \\ x(0) &= x_0 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

is an absolutely continuous map  $\xi: [0, t_0) \rightarrow X$ ,  $0 < t_0 \leq \infty$ , such that

$$\xi(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(\theta_\tau \omega, \xi(\tau), u(\tau)) d\tau, \quad 0 \leq t < t_0. \quad (16)$$

Such a solution is said to be *maximal* if  $[0, s_0) \subseteq [0, t_0)$  whenever  $\zeta: [0, s_0) \rightarrow X$  is a solution. It is said to be *unique* if  $\xi(t) = \zeta(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, t_0) \cap [0, s_0)$ , whenever  $\zeta: [0, s_0) \rightarrow X$  is a solution.

**Definition 3.14** [Flow of An RDEI] Let  $f: \Omega \times X \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be an rhs with respect to  $\theta$ ,  $X$  and  $U$ . Suppose that for each environmental condition  $\omega \in \Omega$ , each initial condition  $x_0 \in X$ , and each stochastic input  $u: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow U$ , there exists a unique, maximal solution

$$\xi_{(\omega, x_0, u)}: [0, t_0(\omega, x_0, u)) \longrightarrow X$$

of (15). The *flow of  $f$*  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi: \mathcal{D}_\varphi &\longrightarrow X \\ (t, \omega, x, u) &\longmapsto \xi_{(\omega, x, u)}(t) \end{aligned} ,$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_\varphi := \{(t, \omega, x, u) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \times S_\theta^U; 0 \leq t < t_0(\omega, x, u)\}.$$

**Theorem 1 (Local RDS through RDE)** Let  $f: \Omega \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be measurable and consider the path-wise random differential equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(\theta_t \omega, x(t)). \quad (17)$$

For each fixed  $\omega \in \Omega$ , define  $f_\omega: \mathbb{R} \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  by

$$f_\omega(t, x) := f(\theta_t \omega, x), \quad (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If  $f_\omega \in L_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{C}^{0,1})$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , then (17) uniquely generates a continuous RDS  $\varphi$  over  $\theta$ .

**Proposition 3.15** Consider the hypothesis and notation in Definition 3.14. Then  $\varphi$  is a local random dynamical system with inputs.

*Proof.* Parts (I1) and (I2) follow from the regularity hypotheses together with the measurability of the limit of measurable maps as well as continuity with respect to initial conditions.

(I3) This follows straight from (16).

(I4) We first do the computations for the case in which  $t_0(\omega, x, u) = \infty$  for all  $(\omega, x, u) \in \Omega \times X \times U$ ; that is,  $\mathcal{D}_\varphi = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times X \times S_\theta^U$ . Fix  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$  and  $u, v \in S_\theta^U$  arbitrarily. Let  $y := \varphi(s, \omega, x, u)$ ; we want to show that

$$\varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, y, v) = \varphi(s + t, \omega, x, w),$$

where  $w: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \rightarrow U$  is defined by

$$w(t, \omega) := \begin{cases} u(\tau, \omega), & 0 \leq \tau < s \\ v(\tau - s, \theta_s \omega), & s \leq \tau \end{cases}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, y, v) &= y + \int_0^t f(\theta_{s+\tau} \omega, \varphi(\tau, \theta_s \omega, y, v), v(\tau, \theta_s \omega)) d\tau \\
&= \varphi(s, \omega, x, u) + \int_0^t f(\theta_{s+\tau} \omega, \varphi(\tau, \theta_s \omega, y, v), v(\tau, \theta_s \omega)) d\tau \\
&= x + \int_0^s f(\theta_\sigma \omega, \varphi(\sigma, \omega, x, u), u(\sigma, \omega)) d\sigma \\
&\quad + \int_0^t f(\theta_{s+\tau} \omega, \varphi(\tau, \theta_s \omega, y, v), v(\tau, \theta_s \omega)) d\tau \\
&= x + \int_0^s f(\theta_\sigma \omega, \varphi(\sigma, \omega, x, u), u(\sigma, \omega)) d\sigma \\
&\quad + \int_s^{s+t} f(\theta_\rho \omega, \varphi(\rho - s, \theta_s \omega, y, v), v(\rho - s, \theta_s \omega)) d\rho,
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, y, v) = x + \int_0^{s+t} f(\theta_\pi \omega, \psi(\pi, \omega, x, w), w(\pi, \omega)) d\pi, \quad (18)$$

where

$$\psi(\pi, \omega, x, w) := \begin{cases} \varphi(\pi, \omega, x, u), & 0 \leq \pi < s \\ \varphi(\pi - s, \theta_s \omega, y, v), & s \leq \pi \end{cases}. \quad (19)$$

Now notice that, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\pi, \omega, x, w) &= \varphi(\pi, \omega, x, u) \\
&= x + \int_0^\pi f(\theta_\tau \omega, \varphi(\tau, \omega, x, u), u(\tau, \omega)) d\tau \\
&= x + \int_0^\pi f(\theta_\tau \omega, \psi(\tau, \omega, x, w), w(\tau, \omega)) d\tau,
\end{aligned}$$

for  $0 \leq \pi < s$ . And since  $t \geq 0$  was chosen arbitrarily, it follows from (18) and (19) that

$$\psi(\pi, \omega, x, w) = x + \int_0^\pi f(\theta_\tau \omega, \psi(\tau, \omega, x, w), w(\tau, \omega)) d\tau, \quad \pi \geq s.$$

Therefore indeed

$$\psi(\pi, \omega, x, w) = x + \int_0^\pi f(\theta_\tau \omega, \psi(\tau, \omega, x, w), w(\tau, \omega)) d\tau, \quad \pi \geq 0.$$

But

$$\varphi(\pi, \omega, x, w) = x + \int_0^\pi f(\theta_\tau \omega, \varphi(\tau, \omega, x, w), w(\tau, \omega)) d\tau, \quad \pi \geq 0,$$

also. Therefore it follows by uniqueness that

$$\varphi(s + t, \omega, x, w) = \psi(s + t, \omega, x, w) = \varphi(t, \theta_s \omega, y, v).$$

(I5) Finally, given  $t \geq 0$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in X$  and  $u, v \in S_\theta^U$  such that  $u(\tau, \omega) = v(\tau, \omega)$  for almost all  $\tau \in [0, t]$ , we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(s, \omega, x, u) &= x + \int_0^s f(\theta_\tau \omega, \varphi(\tau, \omega, x, u), u(\tau, \omega)) d\tau \\
&= x + \int_0^s f(\theta_\tau \omega, \varphi(\tau, \omega, x, u), v(\tau, \omega)) d\tau, \quad 0 \leq s < t.
\end{aligned}$$

It then follows by the assumption of uniqueness (see Definition 3.13) that  $\varphi(t, \omega, x, u) = \varphi(t, \omega, x, v)$ . ■

## 4 Feedback Interconnections

In this section we define the feedback interconnection of two RDSIOs. We want to consider, given systems  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$  and  $(\theta, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{h})$ , an RDS in which the output of the first system is the input to the second one, and viceversa. So throughout the remaining of this section we will refer to two RDSIOs  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$  and  $(\theta, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{h})$  over the same measure preserving dynamical system  $\theta = (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \{\theta_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}})$  and with cocycles and outputs

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi : \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \times X \times S_\theta^U &\longrightarrow X, \\ h : \Omega \times X &\longrightarrow V, \\ \hat{\varphi} : \mathcal{T}_+ \times \Omega \times Z \times S_\theta^V &\longrightarrow Z, \\ \hat{h} : \Omega \times Z &\longrightarrow U.\end{aligned}$$

### 4.1 Discrete Systems

Before we lay down the general abstract framework we consider the feedback interconnection of two discrete systems, that is,  $\mathcal{T} = \mathbb{Z}$ . As we saw in Subsection 3.3, the dynamics of  $\varphi$  and  $\hat{\varphi}$  can be encoded in their generators  $f : \Omega \times X \times U \rightarrow X$  and  $\hat{f} : \Omega \times Z \times V \rightarrow Z$ . Now let

$$\begin{aligned}F : \Omega \times (X \times Z) &\longrightarrow (X \times Z) \\ (\omega, (x, z)) &\longmapsto (f(\omega, x, \hat{h}(\omega, z)), \hat{f}(\omega, z, h(\omega, x))).\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

Let  $\Phi : \Omega \times (X \times Z) \rightarrow (X \times Z)$  be the RDS generated by  $F$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(0, \omega, (x, z)) &:= (x, z), \quad (\omega, (x, z)) \in \Omega \times (X \times Z), \\ \Phi(1, \omega, (x, z)) &:= F(\omega, (x, z)), \quad (\omega, (x, z)) \in \Omega \times (X \times Z),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Phi(n+1, \omega, (x, z)) := F(\theta_n \omega, \Phi(n, \omega, (x, z))), \quad (\omega, (x, z)) \in \Omega \times (X \times Z), \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

recursively. Given initial states  $x \in X$  and  $z \in Z$ , define  $\mu = \mu_{x,z} \in S_\theta^V$  and  $\nu = \nu_{x,z} \in S_\theta^U$  also recursively by

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(\omega, 0) &:= h(\omega, \varphi(0, \omega, x, \nu)) = h(\omega, x), \\ \nu(\omega, 0) &:= \hat{h}(\omega, \hat{\varphi}(0, \omega, z, \mu)) = \hat{h}(\omega, z); \\ \mu(\omega, n) &:= h(\theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x, \nu)), \\ \nu(\omega, n) &:= \hat{h}(\theta_n \omega, \hat{\varphi}(n, \omega, z, \mu)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.\end{aligned}$$

We are, of course, abusing notation a little bit here. The point is that because of causality and independence of irrelevant random states ((I4) and (I5)) we need only know  $\nu|_{\{\omega\} \times [0,n)} = \nu|_{\{\omega\} \times [0,n-1]}$  to compute  $\varphi(n, \omega, x, \nu)$ . Similarly, we need only know  $\mu|_{\{\omega\} \times [0,n)} = \mu|_{\{\omega\} \times [0,n-1]}$  to compute  $\hat{\varphi}(n, \omega, z, \mu)$ , and so the induction is well established. The  $\theta$ -stochastic processes  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  so defined are then the unique  $\theta$ -stochastic processes satisfying the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(\omega, n) &= \hat{h}(\theta_n \omega, \hat{\varphi}(n, \omega, z, \mu)) \\ \mu(\omega, n) &= h(\theta_n \omega, \varphi(n, \omega, x, \nu)).\end{aligned}$$

### 4.2 Random Differential Equations

A similar discussion shows that for systems generated by differential equations with noise, the feedback connection is obtained as the RDS generated by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= f(\omega, x, \hat{h}_z(\omega)) \\ \dot{z} &= \hat{f}(\omega, z, h_x(\omega)).\end{aligned}$$

### 4.3 Abstract Systems

For abstract systems, there is most probably no way to provide a general definition of interconnection. (Similar difficulties arise in control theory, even when studying deterministic systems.) Thus, we proceed axiomatically.

**Definition 4.1** We say that the *feedback (interconnection) of the RDSIO's*  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$  and  $(\theta, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{h})$  is *well-posed* provided that, for each  $x \in X$  and each  $z \in Z$ ,

- (1) there exist  $\mu = \mu_{x,z} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$  and  $\nu = \nu_{x,z} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^V$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(t, \omega) &= h(\theta_t \omega, \varphi(t, \omega, x, \mu)), \\ \mu(t, \omega) &= \hat{h}(\theta_t \omega, \hat{\varphi}(t, \omega, z, \nu)),\end{aligned}$$

for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$  and all  $\omega \in \Omega$ ;

- (2) if  $\mu' \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$ ,  $\nu' \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^V$  are such that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu'(t, \omega) &= h(\theta_t \omega, \varphi(t, \omega, x, \mu')), \\ \mu'(t, \omega) &= \hat{h}(\theta_t \omega, \hat{\varphi}(t, \omega, z, \nu')), \end{aligned}$$

then  $\mu'(\cdot, \omega) = \mu(\cdot, \omega)$  and  $\nu'(\cdot, \omega) = \nu(\cdot, \omega)$  almost surely, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

That is,  $\mu_{x,z}, \nu_{x,z}$  must exist, and be unique in a certain sense for the feedback interconnection to be well-posed.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2** Suppose that the feedback interconnection of  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$  and  $(\theta, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{h})$  is well-posed. Then

$$\psi(t, \omega, (x, z)) := (\varphi(t, \omega, x, \mu_{x,z}), \hat{\varphi}(t, \omega, z, \nu_{x,z})), \quad (t, \omega, (x, z)) \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0} \times \Omega \times (X \times Z),$$

satisfies the cocycle property and  $(\theta, \psi)$  is an RDS with state space the Cartesian product  $X \times Z$ .

### 4.4 Equilibria of feedback systems

**Lemma 4.3** Suppose that the feedback interconnection of  $(\theta_1, \varphi_1, h_1)$  and  $(\theta_2, \varphi_2, h_2)$  is well-posed. Then, the following two properties are equivalent:

1. for the feedback system,  $(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\zeta}) \in \mathcal{E}$ ;
2. there exists a pair of  $\theta$ -constant inputs  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  such that

$$\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{K}(\bar{\nu}), \quad \bar{\nu} \in \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mu}), \quad \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu}), \quad \bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{E}(\bar{\nu}).$$

## 5 Monotone and anti-monotone RDIOS

If  $(Q, \leq)$  is an ordered space and  $p, q \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^X$ , we write “ $p \leq q$ ” to mean that  $p(t, \omega) \leq q(t, \omega)$  for all  $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\geq 0}$  and all  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Definition 5.1** A RDSI  $(\theta, \varphi)$  is *monotone* if  $U, X$  are ordered spaces and

$$x \leq z \text{ and } u \leq v \quad \Rightarrow \quad \xi_{x,u} \leq \xi_{z,v}$$

for  $x, z \in X$  and  $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U$ . An RDSIO  $(\theta, \varphi, h)$  is *monotone* if, in addition,  $Y$  is an ordered space and  $h$  is order-preserving:  $h(\omega, x) \leq h(\omega, z)$  whenever  $x \leq z$  and *anti-monotone* if  $h$  reverses order:  $h(\omega, x) \leq h(\omega, z)$  whenever  $x \geq z$ .  $\square$

For the results sketched below, we restrict attention to ordered spaces induced by cones in Banach spaces as in [6, 7].

Observe that a system is anti-monotone system if and only if

$$x \geq z \text{ and } u \leq v \quad \Rightarrow \quad \eta_{x,u} \leq \eta_{z,v} \quad \forall x, z \in X, u, v \in \mathcal{S}_\theta^U, \quad (21)$$

Sufficiency is clear, since  $h(\omega, x) = \eta_{x,u}(0, \omega) \leq \eta_{z,v}(0, \omega) = h(\omega, z)$ , and the converse follows from  $\eta_{x,u}(t, \omega) = h(\theta_t \omega, \xi_{x,u}(t, \omega)) \leq h(\theta_t \omega, \xi_{z,v}(t, \omega)) = \eta_{z,v}(t, \omega)$ .

An important fact is as follows.

**Theorem 2 (Converging Input/Converging State)** *Let  $\varphi$  be a monotone RDSI with a continuous I/S characteristic  $K^X$ . Suppose that  $u \in S_\theta^U$  and  $\bar{u} \in U_B^\Omega$  are such that*

$$u(t, \theta_{-t} \omega) \longrightarrow \bar{u}(\omega), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad \tilde{\omega} \in \Omega.$$

*Then for any random initial state  $\bar{x} \in X_B^\Omega$ , then almost all pull-back trajectories of  $\varphi$  subject to  $u$  and starting at  $\bar{x}$  converge to  $K^X(\cdot, \bar{u})$ :*

$$\varphi(t, \theta_{-t} \omega, \bar{x}(\theta_{-t} \omega), u) \longrightarrow K^X(\omega, \bar{u}), \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad \tilde{\omega} \in \Omega.$$

## 5.1 Small-gain theorem: discussion

A small-gain theorem for anti-monotone systems follows by the same steps as in the deterministic case ([1, 7]). The key idea is to assume that characteristics are continuous in our tempered sense and that a small gain condition is satisfied. The main theorem will be for an anti-monotone RDSIO so that iterations of characteristics converge to a unique equilibrium, which amounts (subject to mild technical conditions on cones and the space  $X$ ) to the requirement that  $\mathcal{K}$  has no period two points except for a unique equilibrium, in the sense that there exists some  $\mu_0$  so that

$$\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mu})) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}_0.$$

We assume, further, that the feedback connection of this system with itself is well-posed and monotone. Then (almost) every solution of the closed-loop system converges to  $\mathcal{E}(\bar{\mu})$ . A proof as in [1, 7] begins by appealing to the CICS (Converging Input/Converging State) property for monotone RDSIO's, and establishes a contraction property on the "limsup" and "liminf" (defined as in these references) of external signals. An alternative approach is based on the idea in [5], in which one first proves that the feedback of two monotone or two anti-monotone systems is monotone. More precisely, if  $(\theta_1, \varphi_1, h_1)$  and  $(\theta_2, \varphi_2, h_2)$  are both anti-monotone RDSIO's, we consider the following order in  $X_1 \times X_2$ :

$$(x, z) \leq (\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \quad \text{iff} \quad x \leq \tilde{x} \text{ and } \tilde{z} \leq z$$

(that is, the order on the second component is reversed). If, instead,  $(\theta_1, \varphi_1, h_1)$  and  $(\theta_2, \varphi_2, h_2)$  are both monotone RDSIO's, we consider the product order in  $X_1 \times X_2$ :

$$(x, z) \leq (\tilde{x}, \tilde{z}) \quad \text{iff} \quad x \leq \tilde{x} \text{ and } z \leq \tilde{z}.$$

One then shows that the feedback system is monotone, and the small-gain condition assures that there is a unique equilibrium (a.e.) for the composite system, allowing one to appeal to the theorem in [3].

## A Measurability Issues

Though interesting, important, and often nontrivial, measurability issues are often a distraction from the main ideas when one is talking about random dynamical systems. We therefore collect all technicalities concerning measurability into this appendix.

The following Lemma is a standard result from real analysis which is not very often presented in such generality. So we briefly digress into proving it.

**Lemma A.1** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space,  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  a measurable space, and  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  a sequence of measurable maps  $\Omega \rightarrow X$ . If  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost everywhere, then  $f$  is also measurable.

*Proof.* By redefining  $f, f_n, n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  on the set of measure zero where convergence does not happen, if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that convergence occurs everywhere. Let  $U \subseteq X$  be any open set and  $A \subseteq X$  be any closed set. For every  $\omega \in f^{-1}(U)$ , we have  $f_n(\omega) \in U$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough, due to the pointwise convergence. Hence

$$f^{-1}(U) \subseteq \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(U)$$

for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and so

$$f^{-1}(U) \subseteq \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(U). \quad (22)$$

It is also true that

$$\bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(A) \subseteq f^{-1}(A). \quad (23)$$

Indeed, if  $\omega$  is in the set defined by the lefthand side, then there is a subsequence  $(n_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  along which  $f_{n_j}(\omega) \in A$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $f_n(\omega) \rightarrow f(\omega)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $A$  is closed, it follows that  $f(\omega) \in A$  also; that is,  $\omega \in f^{-1}(A)$ .

Now fix an open set  $V \subseteq X$  arbitraliy. For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$A_k := \{x \in X; \text{dist}(x, V^c) \geq 1/k\}$$

and

$$U_k := \{x \in X; \text{dist}(x, V^c) > 1/k\}.$$

Then the  $A_k$ 's are closed, the  $U_k$ 's are open,  $U_k \subseteq A_k$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , and

$$V = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A_k = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} U_k.$$

Now from (23) we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(V) &= \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(A_k) \\ &\supseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(A_k) \\ &\supseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(U_k). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$f^{-1}(V) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(U_k) \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(U_k)$$

by (22). The two inclusions combined yield

$$f^{-1}(V) = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(U_k) \in \mathcal{F},$$

completing the proof. ■

The following proposition is a standard fact from product measures, but we nevertheless state it here to emphasize its for all scope.

**Proposition A.2** Let  $(X, \mathcal{F}), (Y, \mathcal{G}), (Z, \mathcal{H})$  be measurable spaces.

(a) If  $E \in \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ , then

$$E_x := \{y \in Y; (x, y) \in E\} \in \mathcal{G}, \quad \text{for all } x \in X,$$

and likewise

$$E^y := \{x \in X; (x, y) \in E\} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \text{for all } y \in Y.$$

(b) If  $f: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$  is an  $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ -measurable map, then the projection maps  $f_x: Y \rightarrow Z$  and  $f^y: X \rightarrow Z$ , defined by

$$f_x(y) := f(x, y) =: f^y(x), \quad (x, y) \in X \times Y,$$

are  $\mathcal{G}$ -measurable and  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable, respectively, for all  $x \in X$  and all  $y \in Y$ .

*Proof.* See [8, Proposition 2.34, page 65]. ■

**Proposition A.3** Let  $(T, \mathcal{F})$  be a measurable space,  $X$  a separable topological space, also thought of as a measurable space with its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra, and  $f: T \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a measurable function such that  $f(t, \cdot): X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous for each  $t \in T$ . Then the function  $F: T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by

$$F(t) := \sup_{x \in X} f(t, x), \quad t \in T,$$

is also measurable.

*Proof.* Let  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a dense sequence in  $X$ . By Proposition A.2, the functions  $f(\cdot, x_k): T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are measurable for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore it is enough to show that

$$F(t) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f(t, x_k), \quad \forall t \in T. \quad (24)$$

Fix  $t \in T$  arbitrarily and let  $(y_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence in  $X$  such that

$$F(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(t, y_n).$$

For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , pick  $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$|f(t, x_{k_n}) - f(t, y_n)| < 1/n,$$

which is possible since  $f(t, \cdot)$  is continuous and  $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is dense in  $X$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(t, x_{k_n}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(t, y_n) = F(t).$$

Since  $f(t, x) \leq F(t)$  for every  $x \in X$ , this proves (24). ■

## B Spaces of Functions in $\mathbb{R}^d$

**Definition B.1**  $[\mathcal{C}^{k, \delta}]$  Given  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , we define  $\mathcal{C}^{k, \delta}$  to be the Fréchet space of functions  $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  which are  $k$  times continuously differentiable and, for  $\delta > 0$ , whose  $k$ -th derivative is locally  $\delta$ -Hölder continuous—Lipschitz continuous for  $\delta = 1$ —; that is, for every compact subset  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=k} \sup_{\substack{x, y \in K \\ x \neq y}} \frac{|D^\alpha f(x) - D^\alpha f(y)|}{|x - y|^\delta} < \infty.$$

For each such  $K$  we also define the norms  $\|\cdot\|_{k,0;K}, \|\cdot\|_{k,\delta;K} : \mathcal{C}^{k,\delta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\|f\|_{k,0;K} := \sum_{0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k} \sup_{x \in K} |D^\alpha f(x)|$$

and

$$\|f\|_{k,\delta;K} := \|f\|_{k,0;K} + \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \sup_{\substack{x,y \in K \\ x \neq y}} \frac{|D^\alpha f(x) - D^\alpha f(y)|}{|x - y|^\delta}, \quad f \in \mathcal{C}^{k,\delta}.$$

**Definition B.2** [ $L_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{C}^{k,\delta})$ ] Given  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ , we define  $L_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{C}^{k,\delta})$  to be the set of measurable functions  $f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  such that

- (i)  $f(t, \cdot) \in \mathcal{C}^{k,\delta}$  for almost every  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (ii) for every compact set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  and every bounded interval  $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_a^b \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{k,\delta;K} dt < \infty.$$

**Remark B.3** The fact that

$$t \mapsto \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{k,\delta;K}, \quad t \in [a, b],$$

is measurable is not obvious. Suppose (i) in Definition B.2 holds. Redefining  $f(t, \cdot) \equiv 0$  for those values of  $t \in [a, b]$  for which (i) may not hold, if necessary, we may assume (i) holds for all  $t \in [a, b]$ . Observe that a compact set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  constitutes a separable space (any subset of  $\mathbb{R}^d$  does). Also, for each  $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k$ ,  $|D^\alpha|$  is measurable and  $|D^\alpha(t, \cdot)|$  is continuous. So it follows from Proposition A.3 that

$$t \mapsto \sup_{x \in K} |D^\alpha f(x)|, \quad t \in [a, b],$$

is measurable. Therefore

$$t \mapsto \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{k,0;K}, \quad t \in [a, b],$$

is measurable. Similarly, then

$$C := (K \times K) \setminus \{(x, y) \in K \times K; x = y\}.$$

is also separable. So, for  $|\alpha| = k$ ,

$$(t, (x, y)) \mapsto \frac{|D^\alpha f(t, x) - D^\alpha f(t, y)|}{|x - y|^\delta}, \quad (t, (x, y)) \in [a, b] \times C,$$

is measurable, and

$$(x, y) \mapsto \frac{|D^\alpha f(t, x) - D^\alpha f(t, y)|}{|x - y|^\delta}, \quad (x, y) \in C,$$

is continuous for each  $t \in [a, b]$ . It follows again from Proposition A.3 that

$$t \mapsto \sup_{(x,y) \in C} \frac{|D^\alpha f(t, x) - D^\alpha f(t, y)|}{|x - y|^\delta}, \quad t \in [a, b],$$

is measurable, so that

$$t \mapsto \|f(t, \cdot)\|_{k,\delta;K}, \quad t \in [a, b],$$

is also measurable. □

## References

- [1] D. Angeli and E.D. Sontag. Monotone control systems. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 48(10):1684–1698, 2003.
- [2] L. Arnold. *Random Dynamical Systems*. Springer, 2010.
- [3] F. Cao and J. Jiang. On the global attractivity of monotone random dynamical systems. *Proceedings of The American Mathematical Society*, 138(3):891–898, March 2010.
- [4] I. Chueshov. *Monotone Random Systems—Theory and Applications*. Springer, 2002.
- [5] G.A. Enciso, H.L. Smith, and E.D. Sontag. Non-monotone systems decomposable into monotone systems with negative feedback. *J. of Differential Equations*, 224:205–227, 2006.
- [6] G.A. Enciso and E.D. Sontag. Monotone systems under positive feedback: multistability and a reduction theorem. *Systems Control Lett.*, 54(2):159–168, 2005.
- [7] G.A. Enciso and E.D. Sontag. Global attractivity, I/O monotone small-gain theorems, and biological delay systems. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 14(3):549–578, 2006.
- [8] G. B. Folland. *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications*. Wiley, second edition, 1999.
- [9] M. Hirsch. Differential equations and convergence almost everywhere in strongly monotone flows. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 17:267–285, 1983.
- [10] M. Hirsch. Systems of differential equations that are competitive or cooperative ii: Convergence almost everywhere. *SIAM J. Mathematical Analysis*, 16:423–439, 1985.
- [11] M. Hirsch and H.L. Smith. Monotone dynamical systems. In *Handbook of Differential Equations, Ordinary Differential Equations (second volume)*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2005.
- [12] H. Smith. *Monotone dynamical systems: An introduction to the theory of competitive and cooperative systems, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 41*. AMS, Providence, RI, 1995.
- [13] E.D. Sontag. *Mathematical Control Theory. Deterministic Finite-Dimensional Systems*, volume 6 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.